UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,211	11/09/2000	Gregg Williams	20508-000100	2557

51111	7590	09/25/2006

AKA CHAN LLP
900 LAFAYETTE STREET
SUITE 710
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER
TARAE, CATHERINE MICHELLE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 July 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 7,

2006 has been entered.

Claims 1-28, 33, 35-37, 39-42, 47 and 48 have been amended. Claims 1-48 are

currently pending.

Response to Amendment

2.   Applicant's amendments to claims 1-28, 33, 35-37, 39-42, 47 and 48 are

acknowledged.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections provided

below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chaudhuri et al. "An overview of data warehousing and OLAP technology," *ACM*

SUGMOD Record, 1997.

As per claim 10, Chaudhuri et al. discloses a method for analyzing marketing

information comprising:

receiving a plurality of marketing information and archiving the plurality of

marketing information into a repository (page 14, bottom of left col.; Marketing and sales

information (i.e., data marts) are used for analysis.);

retrieving from the repository a plurality of selected marketing information (page

14, bottom of right col.; The data marts are stored on data warehouse servers. The

data marts are retrieved when analysis of the data marts is desired.);

transforming the plurality of selected marketing information into a plurality of

transition table format information (page 14, bottom of right col.; page 15; The data in

the data marts are received from operational databases and external sources, then are

cleansed and transformed, and thus, are in transition table format.);

populating a facts database with the transition table format information to
produce at least one of a plurality of facts tables with a summarization of the transition
table format information, wherein the facts tables are structured hierarchically (page 17,
right col.; page 18, left col.; The database includes a facts table that summarizes the
data in the data marts (i.e., transition tables).);

denormalizing the summarization of the transition table format information to
produce a plurality of denormalized information, said denormalizing comprising
populating selected information from at least one of a plurality of facts tables, stored in a
facts table database, to a key table, stored in a groupings tables database, wherein the
denormalizing further comprises propagating the selected information from one table to
another, each of the tables being at a different level of a hierarchical structure based on
the hierarchy of the facts tables (page 17, right col.; page 18, left col.; The fact table
acts as a key table as each tuple in the fact table consists of a pointer, or key, to each of
the transition tables. Figure 3 shows denormalized data using the dimension tables.);
and

providing a report based upon the denormalized information, wherein the report
references the key table and not the at least one of the plurality of facts tables (page 18,
bottom of right col.-page 19, top of left col.; Reports are generated using join indices,
which match foreign keys to their primary keys.), the at least one of the plurality of facts
tables includes at least one of a source category table, a source table, a campaign
table, or a panels table (Figure 3; The fact table includes product and salesperson, or
source, data.).

While Chaudhuri et al. does not expressly disclose using direct marketing

subscription information, Chaudhuri et al. does disclose using data marts, which are

departmental subsets focused on selected subjects, such as marketing and sales

information (page 14, bottom of left col.). Additionally, the direct marketing subscription

information amounts to merely non-functional, descriptive data as it does not affect how

the steps of the method are performed or how the structural elements of the system

function. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the

type of data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the type of

data. Therefore, the type of data does not provide a patentable distinction over the prior

art. Thus, this descriptive data will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior

art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404

(Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP

§ 2106. Accordingly, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art for the system of Chaudhuri et al. to use direct

marketing subscription information as Chaudhuri et al. expressly discloses using data

marts, which are data specific to an organization's department such as a marketing

department (page 14, bottom of left col.). Direct marketing subscription information is

merely a specific type of marketing data useful to a marketing department that conducts

direct marketing to subscribers. Thus, the system of Chaudhuri et al. would be

beneficial to marketing departments that conduct direct marketing to subscribers as the

system of Chaudhuri et al. would enable marketing managers/analysts to make better

and faster decisions about their direct marketing strategies through Chaudhuri et al.'s

data warehousing techniques (page 13).

As per claim 11, Chaudhuri et al. discloses the method of claim 10 further

comprising:

receiving input of at least one criteria for at least one of a plurality of reports and

providing the report based upon the denormalized information according to the at least

one criteria (page 17; Stored procedures, or managed queries, are used to generate

reports on the denormalized information. The stored procedures, or managed queries,

may generate reports on a variety of criteria.).

As per claim 12, Chaudhuri et al. discloses the method of claim 10 further

comprising:

receiving input of at least one criteria for at least one of a plurality of tables and

configuring the at least one of the plurality of tables based upon the at least one criteria

(page 17; page 18, right col.; page 19, top of left col.; Ad hoc SQL queries (such as

index and join operations) are also used to manipulate the tables.).

As per claims 13 and 14, Chaudhuri et al. discloses the method of claim 10,

further comprising: implementing authorization and access procedures (page 21, left

col.; Metadata and warehouse management is used to manage user profiles,

authorization and access control policies.). Chaudhuri et al. does not expressly disclose

receiving input of at least one of a username and a password, verifying whether the

input of the at least one of a username and a password corresponds to a user

authorized to access reporting procedures and providing access to reporting procedures

to the user if the user is determined to be authorized. However, the use of usernames

and passwords as a means to control access to data so that only authorized users

access the data is old and well known in the art. Since Chaudhuri et al. teaches

implementing authorization and access control policies, at the time of the invention, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the system of

Chaudhuri et al. to implement username and password procedures to verify that a user

is authorized to access data because doing so enhances the existing objective of the

system of Chaudhuri et al. to ensure that only authorized users access the data.

Claims 1-9 and 15-48 recite substantially similar subject matter to claims 10-14

above. Therefore, claims 1-9 and 15-48 are rejected on the same basis as claims 10-

14 above.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

- Colby et al. (U.S. 6,480,836) discusses generating candidate views for a
  database;

- Rauer et al. (U.S. 6,161,103) discusses creating aggregates for use in a
  datamart;

- Bakalash et al. (U.S. 6,385,604) discusses relational database management;

- Shah et al. (U.S. 7,080,090) discusses star schema multi-dimensional data
  warehouse;

- Bock et al. "Benefits of Denormalized Relational Database Tables," *1996 Proceedings of the Decision Sciences Institute*, 1996 [retrieved from Internet] discusses denormalizing database tables;

- "Chapter 20 Database Design Issues," *Microsoft SQL Server DBA Survival Guide – Chapter 20*, 1997 [retrieved from Internet] discusses denormalizing database tables;

- Golfarelli et al. "The Dimensional Fact Model: A Conceptual Model for Data Warehouses," IJCIS, 1998 [retrieved from Internet] discusses denormalizing data in a database.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Michelle Tarae (formerly, C. Michelle Colon) whose telephone number is 571-272-6727. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached at 571-272-6729.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. Michelle Tarae
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3623

September 15, 2006